

Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #947
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Wed, 29 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 947

Today's Topics:

(#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters (2 msgs)
 Are we ALLOWED to listen?
 Listening to private communications
 Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski (2 msgs)
 Restrictions on RECEIVING signals in England....

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:29:30 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
Message-ID: <8771.25738049@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: bowen@cs.Buffalo.EDU (Devon Bowen)

> Look who's gone off the deep end. What country do you think this is?? If
> there are any criminals on the net they are probably bright enough to
> know
> that this type of info and the helping hardware is trivial to come by.

This net is not that difficult to access. In a town with a UFGate, any kid with
a C64 can do it.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

do it.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:29:43 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
Message-ID: <8773.25738058@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook)
>
>
> Regarding the controversey that Jim Grubbs has been stirring up as an
> "advocate" of the ECPA, I think he just LOVES to argue. A couple of
> months ago on the national Fidonet ham radio echo he got things jumping
> over there by telling a lot of prospective hams that checking out a
> piece of ham gear ON THE AIR before buying it was a federal crime,
> because there was obvious pecuniary interest! (In the examples being
> discussed, all parties were licensed). When I jumped in and told
> these poor Novices that trying out a radio before buying it was legal,

It is NOT legal, Tad. Darin Arrick asked if it is legal. I replied by quoting Part 97, to wit:

S 97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(a) No amateur station shall transmit any communication the purpose of which is to facilitate the business or commercial affairs of any party. No station shall transmit communications as

In response you became so confused you started to try to convince everyone that the FCC no longer issues amateur station licenses.

Sheesh!

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:30:11 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: Are we ALLOWED to listen?
Message-ID: <8775.2573806B@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: mgb@APG-TECNET.APG.ARMY.MIL
> *cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs
> *@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs) replies yet again:
> (And this is all out of order from many different postings)
>
> > Pray tell, dear Jim: what is the difference between Bob's posting of

> > the frequencies of department store dicks and Radio Shack's selling
> > the frequencies of all the police frequencies in the USA?
>

> *In principle, none. In practice, the shop cop frequencies (combined with

.....

> accept my sincerest apologies. I realize that now I am part of the
> problem instead of being part of the cure. :-(Oh well.....

"We have met the enemy and he is us." - Pogo

ve met the enemy and he is us." - Pogo

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:29:58 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: Listening to private communications
Message-ID: <8774.25738062@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman)
>
> From the Associated Press, 11/22/89:
>
> Regarding the Discovery Shuttle mission -
> "Sources close to the project reported the astronauts are to deploy a
> \$300 million 2 1/2 ton signal intelligence satellite designed to
> eavesdrop
> on military and diplomatic communications in the Soviet Union and other
> countries."
>
> Jim... isn't that immoral?

Yes, as is everything about war or quasi-war.

> Why don't you make them stop it.

I'm too busy trying to get them to stop matching every cost-of-living increase
in my Social Security benefits with equal increases in my Medicare premiums.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

th equal increases in my Medicare premiums.

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:29:33 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski
Message-ID: <8772.25738050@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: ron@hpfcmgw.HP.COM (Ron Miller)
>
> Jim, why are you making all this fuss? Bob's postings and Eugene's
> questions about scanner frequencies aren't meant for you. You weren't
> supposed to read them.
>
> Stop reading their postings. Stop it right now! Bob was talking to Eugene
> and myself.

On my machine, it says "To: All".

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 29 Nov 89 06:29:17 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Jim Grubs)
Subject: Military aircraft callsigns...Eugene Balinski
Message-ID: <8770.25738040@stjhmc.fidonet.org>

> From: kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman)

> In article <8553.256964FE@stjhmc.fidonet.org>
> Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org (Jim Grubs) writes:
> >> From: kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman)
>
> - > You obviously have never listened to the transmissions in question.
> The
> - > SAC
> - > air frequencies (Giant Talk) are NOT encrypted most of the time.
>
> >As a member of USAF MARS BST activities
> >I did more of that sort of thing than you might imagine.
>
> The comment stands, however. If you HAD listened to the transmissions,
> you
> would realize that they were NOT encrypted. As a member of the military,
> you
> should also be aware that anything they want secure, will be secure. If
> they
> transmit in the clear, they don't care who listens. Why should you?

I guess you forgot that I didn't get testy until the issue got beyond the radio signals and became inquiring into bases and missions.

> - > - > Are you telling me that it is OK for the Russians to listen to SAC,
> but
> - > - > NOT OK
> - > - > for Americans to listen to SAC?
> - >
> - > >It's not OK for either.
> - >
> - > Right. Well, you get the Russians to stop, then maybe I'll stop.
>
> >Poor excuse! Do you also apply that logic to, say, income tax evasion?
> Vote
> >fraud? Shoplifting?
>
> Non sequitor. What you are implying, is that it is somehow "immoral" to
> listen
> to the radio.

Only if it involves snooping into other's private lives/business. I guess my hangup is the mentality of the people engaged in the practice. I can't fathom why any moral, intelligent person would WANT to snoop like that.

> - > - > When I was a kid, we had the Communications Act of 1934, which said
> I
> - > - > could
> - > - > listen to ANYTHING, so long as I didn't use it for commercial gain.

> - > I'm
> - > - > certainly not going to trust YOU to decide what I can listen to!
>
> >The privacy portions of it were intended to forbid disclosure of private
> (as
> >opposed to BC) information which one happened upon by chance. I do not
> believe
> >the authors anticipated that a cult of people who search out such
> information
> >would arise. In that sense ECPA is a correction of an omission. If the
> authors
> >of the CommAct had anticipated that cult, the CommAct provisions you cite
> as
> >permission would not likely exist.
>
> And for some reason, no one noticed for 50+ years. Sure.

No, it did not develop to the present blatancy until fairly recently. Before that, people voluntarily minded their own business simply because it was the polite thing to do.

But enough of this. Neither of us is going to change his mind, so why beat the issue to death?

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

ugh of this. Neither of us is going to change his mind, so why beat the issue to death?

73 de Jim Grubs, W8GRT

--

Uucp: ...{gatech,ames,rutgers}!ncar!noao!asuvax!stjhmc!234!1!Jim.Grubs
Internet: Jim.Grubs@f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org

Date: 28 Nov 89 16:45:07 GMT
From: eru!luth!sunic!mcsun!ukc!strath-cs!cs.glasgow.ac.uk!pottera@bloom-beacon.mit.edu (Alan T Potter)
Subject: Restrictions on RECEIVING signals in England....
Message-ID: <3865@vanuata.cs.glasgow.ac.uk>

In article <6563@lynx.UUCP> neal@lynx.UUCP (Neal Woodall) writes:
>In article <24.Nov.89.14:59:49.GMT.#7127@UK.AC.NWL.IA> Matt Brunton writes:
>

>>.....Over here in the UK the law lets you
>>listen to licensed radio amateurs, licensed CB operators and
>>broadcasters AND THAT IS IT.
>
>Do you thin this is GOOD? If you do, I feel sorry for you.....
>
>Just another reason for me to think that England is a police state. This may
>not be ther proper forum, but then again maybe it is....I will let the readers
>decide.....
>
>England seems to have many laws that classify it as a police state: No right
>of free speech,

Erm - eh?

>very restrictive gun laws,

Personally, I think that this is a damned good idea...

>an oppressive "Big Brother"-type government,

Big sister, please...

>high taxes.....

Not really, our top rate is 40%. I think (but can't promise) that that
makes us the lowest taxed nation in Europe...

>and now I find out this: you cannot even listen to radio waves passing
>through your own body!

My understanding of this law is that one may listen, but not take any
actions becuae of what one hears or pass the information on to a third party.
Specifically may not make any financial gain through listening to such
broadcasts.

>
>Did you hear the recent story about how the English government gave the
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Ahem. There is no such organisation. The government at Westminster is the
government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain (ie England, Scotland and
Wales) and Northern Ireland. An equivalent may be for us to start referring
to the entire USA as Washington.

>environmental group Greenpeace a hard time? You may not agree with the
>politics or the actions of Greenpeace, but the story tells much about how
>the Police State in England operates.....

>

>It seems that Greenpeace was trying to promote their new record album called
>"Rainbow Warriors". All the proceeds go to help Greenpeace fight for their
>environmental concerns. Several English rock stars are on the album, and they
>wanted to air commercials in England for the album.

>

>Well, the English gov't took issue with this. Then they forced Greenpeace to
>follow certain "guidelines" set up especially for the advertising of the
>Greenpeace album: the ads could NOT suggest that the artists supported
>Greenpeace, could NOT use the words "Greenpeace", "green", "tree", or "whale"!
>The artists could not even SUGGEST that they were concerned over the state
>of the environment! According to the English gov't, it was all too "political"

No - they were not told that they couldn't say that they were concerned about
the environment, or use those words. What they were told was that they were
not allowed to advertise Greenpeace.

In Britain, at that time, *no* charities were allowed to advertise on TV. The
idea was that since smaller charities cannot afford such advertising, it was
better not to allow any to advertise. Now that rule is about to change, and
such an advert will probably be okay. However, political organisations are not
allowed to advertise on television or radio, in order that we do not end up
in the US situation where the party with most cash to spend on nauseating
adverts wins the election.

>

>Now, contrast this with the SOVIET UNION, where there were NO such restrictions
>set up by the government.

>

>According to Ian Flooks, a media promoter in London who helped Greenpeace with
>their legal battles, "I began to wonder who was living in the police state".

I wonder how much Greenpeace would have prospered if its development had
been in the USSR rather than the UK.

>

>>How would Jim (or anyone else on the list) like our situation??

>

>If you cannot tell from my above posting, I will spell it out for you:
>I think it stinks! Now, you did not post what YOU think about the situation...
>do you agree with it, or does it make you mad? Why don't you work to try
>and change it.....but, I suspect that not enough people in England care
>about the situation.

>

I don't know what Matt thinks, but I reckon that we don't have things
too bad. There are problems, of course. A major one is the ban on
reporting of speeches made by terrorists and their apologists WRT
Northern Ireland. I abhor these lunatics and their evil ways, but

to ban them from showing themselves up in public is, IMHO, a very bad piece of legislation. We have pretty autocratic government, but that may be changing fairly soon.

regards,
Alan

PS I'd agree that this is not the right forum for this discussion. How about /dev/null?

--

```
| Janet : pottera@uk.ac.glasgow.cs | USEnet : mcvax!cs.glasgow.ac.uk!pottera |
| ARPAnet: pottera@cs.glasgow.ac.uk | Comp Sci, Glasgow Univ, Scotland, UK   |
    Hand me the wine and the dice, while there are grapes on the vine
    And I have thirst and lust for living...
```

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #947
